

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application in light of the following discussion is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-6 and 8-10 are presently pending in this application.

In the outstanding Office Action, Claims 1-6 and 8-10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Baba et al. (U.S. Patent 6,085,598).

Briefly, Claim 1 of the present invention is directed to a mounting structure for a vehicle electrical connection box, including a protruding member provided to a box body of the electrical connection box and positioned to receive an impact from a first direction, and the protruding member is positioned such that the box body receives the impact off the center of rotation of the box body.

The outstanding Office Action asserts that Baba et al. disclose a protruding member. Nevertheless, Baba et al. do not teach a protruding member “positioned such that *the box body receives the impact off the center of rotation of the box body*” as recited in Claim 1 (emphasis added in Italic). On the other hand, Baba et al. disclose the connector (11) connected to the sensor portion (2). When the connector (11) receives an impact, for example, in the direction “E” shown in Fig. 7B, the line of action of the impact force is believed to pass through the center of rotation of the sensor portion (2). Therefore, the structure recited in Claim 1 is believed to be clearly distinguishable from Baba et al..

Claim 2 is directed to a mounting structure for a vehicle electrical connection box arranged rearward of and in the vicinity of a dash panel serving as a partition between an engine space in a vehicle and an adjacent compartment and includes at least one breakable planar mounting member mounting the box body to a cowl side panel of the vehicle.

The outstanding Office Action asserts that Baba et al. disclose the at least one breakable planar mounting member. However, Baba et al. do not teach “at least one

breakable *planar* mounting member mounting the box body to a cowl side panel of the vehicle” as recited in Claim 2 (emphasis added in Italic). According to Baba et al., the connecting member (21) is integrally formed with the cover (20), and a pair of stubs (24) is also integrally formed with the cover (20).¹ As such, the mounting member of the Baba et al. apparatus is not formed as a planar member. Therefore, the structure recited in Claim 2 is also believed to be clearly distinguishable from Baba et al..

Turning to Claim 3, Claim 3 is directed to a mounting structure for a vehicle electrical connection box having a box body including at least two breakable planar mounting members mounting the box body to a part of a vehicle, extending substantially along a first plane and diagonally positioned to break after the box body receives an impact in a direction substantially parallel to the first plane.

Although the outstanding Office Action asserts otherwise, Baba et al. do not teach “at least *two* breakable *planar* mounting members mounting the box body to a part of a vehicle, extending substantially along a first plane and *diagonally positioned*” as recited in Claim 3 (emphasis added in Italic). Like the connecting member (21), the connecting member (321) is integrally formed with the cover (320),² and therefore the mounting member of the Baba et al. apparatus is formed as a single, non-planar member. Further, Baba et al. do not disclose *diagonally positioned* mounting members. Therefore, the structure recited in Claim 3 is believed to be distinguishable from Baba et al. as well.

For the foregoing reasons, Claims 1-3 are believed to be allowable. Furthermore, since Claims 4-6 and 8-10 depend directly from one of Claims 1-3, substantially the same arguments set forth above also apply to these dependent claims. Hence, Claims 4-6 and 8-10 are believed to be allowable as well.

¹ See Baba et al., column 4, lines 56-60.

² See *id.*, Fig. 12, and column 7, lines 43-45.

Application No. 09/987,879
Reply to Office Action of June 11, 2003

In view of the discussions presented above, Applicant respectfully submits that the present application is in condition for allowance, and an early action favorable to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Gregory J. Maier
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 25,599

Akihiro Yamazaki
Registration No. 46,155

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 08/03)

GJM/AY/YO:fm
\ZEUS\PACIFIC\FILES\ATTY\YO\21s\216153\AME4-
MDFD.DOC